

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 19, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of this Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claims 1-26 are Allowable over *Underwood*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,718,535 to Underwood ("Underwood"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

A system for mapping values collected in connection with creation of end-user orders for communications services to corresponding inter-provider orders, comprising:

an end-user ordering module operable to:

determine whether an end-user requested service item contained in a service provider product catalog relates to *a service item type having at least one associated developer defined label (DDL)*, the DDL extending the attributes of the associated service item type by *specifying an additional attribute for which a value may be collected from the end-user and supplied in connection with creation of an end-user order for the requested service item, the value not needed to complete the end-user order but collected and supplied to avoid needing to collect the value from the end-user in connection with subsequent creation of an inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order;*

if the requested service item relates to a service item type having at least one DDL, prompt a user of the end-user ordering module to collect from the end-user and supply a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute in connection with creation of the end-user order for the requested service item; and

communicate the end-user order for use in subsequently creating the corresponding inter-provider order; and

an inter-provider ordering module coupled to the end-user ordering module and operable to:

receive the end-user order;

determine whether the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute; and

if the end-user order has a value for the additional DDL-specified attribute, automatically map the value from the end-user order to an appropriate field of the inter-provider order such that the value need not be collected from the end-user in connection with creation of the inter-provider order.

Independent Claims 8, 15, and 22-26 recite certain substantially similar limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Underwood* does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element recited in independent Claim 1. For example, *Underwood* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a service item type having at least one associated developer defined label (DDL),” as recited in Claim 1. Nor does *Underwood* disclose, teach, or suggest “specifying an additional attribute for which a value may be collected from the end-user and supplied in connection with creation of an end-user order for the requested service item” or that “the value [is] not needed to complete the end-user order but collected and supplied to avoid needing to collect the value from the end-user in connection with subsequent creation of an inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order,” as recited in Claim 1. In fact, *Underwood* fails to refer in any way to a “developer defined label,” an “end-user order for the requested service item,” or an “inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order,” as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner states, “Underwood discloses determine whether the end-user order has a value for the DDL-specified attribute.” In support of this statement, the Examiner cites to Column 91, Lines 12-19 and Column 90 Lines 43-53. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of *Underwood* do not disclose anything about an “end-user order,” “a value,” or a “specified attribute.” Furthermore, although the cited portions of *Underwood* use the acronym “DDL,” nothing in *Underwood* discloses, teaches, or suggests that the acronym “DDL” as it is used in *Underwood* has the same meaning as “DDL” as recited in Claim 1. Claim 1 recites “a service item type having at least one associated developer defined label (DDL).” In contrast, the cited portions of *Underwood* merely disclose “some data modeling tools allow generation of an object model from the legacy database model (DDL)” (Column 90, Lines 44-45) and “Rational Software’s Rational Rose 98 provides Oracle8 data modeling functionality including schema analysis, SQL/DDL generation, reporting and editing.” Although not disclosed in *Underwood*, given the context, the acronym “DDL” used in *Underwood* likely stands for “data definition language,” a subset of SQL commands used to create database objects.

The Examiner acknowledges “Underwood does not disclose additional DDL,” but states “Official notice is taken that this feature is old and well known in the e-commerce art and/or retail art.” Applicants respectfully traverse this statement. First, the Examiner’s acknowledgement refers to an “additional DDL,” while Claim 1 recites “additional DDL-specified attribute,” making it unclear whether the Examiner is addressing the correct “additional” component. Second, if the Examiner did intend to address the “additional DDL-specified attribute,” Applicants agree that *Underwood* does not disclose this aspect of Claim 1. Third, to the extent that the Examiner is asserting that any limitation in Claim 1 is “old and well known,” Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference in support of this position pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, or if the Examiner relies on personal knowledge to support the taking of Official Notice, the Examiner provide an affidavit supporting such facts pursuant to M.P.E.P. 2144.03. Fourth, the Examiner asserts that “mere multiplicity is not novel absent a new function.” However, the “additional DDL-specified attribute,” recited in Claim 1, is not mere multiplicity as the Examiner suggests. This is made clear by the language of Claim 1, which recites, “an additional attribute for which a value may be collected from the end-user and supplied in connection with creation of an end-user order for the requested service item, the value not needed to complete the end-user order but collected and supplied to avoid needing to collect the value from the end-user in connection with subsequent creation of an inter-provider order that corresponds to the end-user order.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22-26 and their dependent claims.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Christopher W. Kennerly, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6812.

Applicants believe that no fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Christopher W. Kennerly
Reg. No. 40,675

Date: April 18, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number:

05073